

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

C.R.No. 1772 of 2006

Date of decision : 3.11.2006.

Varinderpal Singh

.....Petitioner.

Versus

M/s Woodtex

.....Respondent.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD K. SHARMA

Present : Mr.A.P.Bhandari, Advocate
for the petitioner.

VINOD K. SHARMA,J.(ORAL)

The present revision petition has been filed against the concurrent findings of fact holding that no cogent and convincing evidence was led by the petitioner to prove that the respondent has materially impaired the value and utility of the premises in dispute by making additions and alterations without consent of the petitioner. The evidence led by the petitioner has been duly considered by the learned courts below and they have recorded the concurrent finding of the fact that the petitioner has failed to prove that there has been any material alteration made by the respondent tenant. The court also took notice of the fact that the cracks in the building shown in the photograph do not in any way prove that the building had become unfit and unsafe. The learned counsel contends that the evidence has not been appreciated by Courts below. It is settled law that even if other views can be formed by this court, it is not open for this court to reappraise the evidence in exercise of revisional jurisdiction.

No ground is made out which may call for interference by this Court in revisional jurisdiction.

Dismissed.

November 3,2006
'sp'

(VINOD K. SHARMA)
JUDGE